

### **REMARKS**

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested in view of the following amendment and argument. Claims 49-53 have been canceled and new claims 54 and 55 have been added. The cancellation of unelected claims 49-53 is made without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Claims 31-48, 54, and 55 are pending in this application.

Support for new dependent claims 54 and 55 may be found at least on page 3, line 17 through page 4, line 4 of the present application as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment introduces no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132. For at least these reasons, entry of the present Amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

### ***Summary of the Restriction Requirement***

In the Office Action, the Examiner has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. §§121 and 372 to one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: Claims 31-48, drawn to a method for wrapping an article.

Group II: Claims 49-53, drawn to a polymeric sheet.

With regard to this grouping, the Examiner has indicated that "[t]he inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Group I has the special technical features a stretching

means comprising rollers which is not present in Group II.”

***Election***

Applicants hereby elect Group I, which now includes claims 31-48, drawn to a method for wrapping an article, without traverse.

New claims 54 and 55 are drawn to a method for wrapping an article and depend from claim 31. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 54 and 55, and claims 31-48, are related to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Restriction Requirement and respectfully submits that all of the stated reasons for the Restriction Requirement have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
**THE NATH LAW GROUP**

November 3, 2009

THE NATH LAW GROUP  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703)548-6284



Susanne Hopkins  
Registration No. 33,247  
Derek Richmond  
Registration No. 45,771  
Sung-Yeop Chung  
Registration No. 64,130  
Customer No. 20529